

DO

S

BI

TH

1881
THE ^{1,42-10}
DOMINION CAMPAIGN!

DANIEL CAREY,
*Barrister, Attorney,
Solicitor & Notary Public;*
WINNIPEG, MANITOBA.

SIR JOHN MACDONALD

ON THE

QUESTIONS AT ISSUE

BEFORE THE PEOPLE.

1881. (?)

THE PREMIER'S GREAT SPEECH

BEFORE THE

WORKINGMEN OF TORONTO.

DOMINION CAMPAGNE

SIR JOHN MACDONALD

BEFORE THE PEOPLE

THE PRINCE'S GREAT SPEECH

WORKINGMEN OF TORONTO.

T
A
Am
ausp
Mr.
the
tren
said

A BRILLIANT REVIEW **OF THE** **VITAL ISSUES** **OF** **THE PRESENT CAMPAIGN.**

A mass meeting of the electors of Toronto was held in the Amphitheatre on the night of Tuesday, May 30th, under the auspices of the National Workingmen's Union of Canada. Mr. J. Ick Evans occupied the chair. Sir John Macdonald, the principal speaker of the evening, was greeted with tremendous cheering. Order having been restored, Sir John said:—

Meeting Old Friends.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen—When I stand in this place and see this crowded amphitheatre, I begin to think that I must be a regular old Rip Van Winkle (loud laughter) that I have been asleep for three years; but that I now come to find the same place, the same crowd, the same friends, the same enthusiasm, the same supporters as I had on this same ground in 1878. (Loud cheers.)

A Voice—More.

SIR JOHN MACDONALD—Yes; as a friend says behind me, a larger crowd; because, thanks to the N.P., Toronto has grown larger, the population has increased, you are all richer, you have better looking hats—(laughter)—and better looking coats. (Cheers and laughter.) And, I really must say as a bloated aristocrat and office-holder, that I myself am not a bit the worse for my three years' salary. (Renewed laughter.) I therefore congratulate myself, you, and the country, that after three years I come back and find enthusiasm, hope—not only hope, but certainty—of the future. (Great cheering.) Let us look back to the year before the 17th of September,

1878. Let us remember the time of depression, the time of sinking hearts, empty pockets, and empty larders—(hear, hear, and applause)—and let us bear in mind that since the National Policy has been inaugurated we see in the country a prosperous, contented, and happy people, and we find Canada standing amongst the first of the nations in the world in credit, in resources, in standing, in reputation, and in fruition. (Cheers.) Mr. Chairman, I owe much, and those who act with me owe much, to the people of Toronto, to

The Workingmen of Toronto.

(Loud cheers.) It was here on this platform that the first spark was lighted. (Applause.) It was here that the wave of enthusiasm which spread over the whole Dominion originated. (Cheers.) It was here that the foundations of the National Policy were laid. (Cheers.) And I ask you if there has not been a noble, magnificent superstructure raised on the foundation which you, the workingmen of Toronto, so successfully prepared in 1878. (Applause.) You gave me your confidence, gentlemen—and although it was said by those who were opposed to me that my policy was only a pretence, that the line I had taken in Parliament, the line that the Conservative Opposition had taken in Parliament with a view to rescuing the country from the depression was only a political cry, that when we came into power we would not carry out our policy, that there would be no National Policy, no readjustment of the tariff, no attempt to encourage our industries, agricultural, manufacturing, and mining, that our policy was a mere political dodge, and that we were not in earnest—although all this was said, we did carry out our policy. (Cheers.) And I appeal to you as workingmen to witness whether I have not fully carried out the pledges I made before I took office, whether the tariff you expected has not been adopted, whether the industries which I said ought to be encouraged have not been developed, and whether instead of despondency there is not now hope, enterprise, and activity in every branch of business, public and private? (Cheers.) It is true, gentlemen, we see yet but the infancy of the manufactures and industries which we have established, or have tried to establish. These things cannot be established in a hurry. You cannot plant the seed to-day and get the crop to-morrow. But we have sown the seed; and much more rapidly, much more speedily, than even I—sanguine as I was of the success of the policy—expected, it has grown; and it now shows the

certain
envie
(Chee
are
early

alread
has b
Beca
have
gentl
"It i
Canad
than
all th
policy
day."
—and
know
waiti
large
waiti
in ma
Oppo
rary
becau
the n
after
Polic
econ
hear
talist
by s
refer
put
writ
are
field
fact
but
the
in t
and

certainty of a future crop which will make this country envied and looked up to by every other country in the world. (Cheers.) Mr. Chairman, although our progress is great, we are still in the bud, hoping and believing that there will be an early flower and early maturity. And

Why are we not in Maturity

already? Three years is a short time, but in three years much has been done. Why, then, I ask, has not more been done? Because we have had an unscrupulous Opposition; because we have had an unpatriotic Opposition. (Loud cheers.) The gentlemen composing that Opposition have told capitalists, "It is no use your investing your money in manufactures in Canada, because the present Government will never last more than five years. A new vote of the people will sweep away all that, and we will return to power and adopt a free trade policy, and reverse that under which the country prospers to-day." That, in effect, has been their statement, and I tell you—and this is not a matter of supposition, but of certainty and knowledge on my part—that there are millions of dollars waiting to be invested in Canada; millions in England, and large sums in the United States, waiting to come to Canada, waiting to be invested in every kind of industry, in mines and in manufactures of every kind; but the capitalists say, "Your Opposition say that your policy is only the result of a temporary madness on the part of the people of Canada in 1878, because times were bad then, and that it will be reversed at the next election." (Cries of "Never, never.") They say that after the next election Sir John Macdonald and the National Policy will disappear, and we will have Reform purity, and economy, and free trade. (Renewed cries of "Never.") I hear you, gentlemen, and I know that you are right. Capitalists, men who have by hard work and great industry, but by slow degrees, collected capital, are naturally timid with reference to the investments they make. They do not like to put their money in an uncertain enterprise; and they have written to me, and to Sir Leonard Tilley, saying, "We are ready to invest large sums of money; Canada is a great field for enterprise; it is a country of all others where manufactures can be most successfully introduced and carried on, but we are told by Mr. Mackenzie"—and, sir, this was said in the Parliament of Canada in my hearing, and you will find it in the published debate—"that protection is a national folly and a national crime, and that it must be abandoned." Sir

Richard Cartwright too, the mixer and muddler of figures—(hear, hear, and laughter)—who kept the financial conscience of Mr. Mackenzie, and expects to keep the financial conscience of Edward Blake, said—what? That all protection was legalized robbery. (Laughter.) So capitalists are afraid to invest money in this country. Mr. Blake says in his address, “Why did these gentlemen dissolve and go to the country? Why did they ask the people to give a verdict when they might have remained in power eighteen months longer?” Our answer was this: That we wanted to let the people declare after three years’ experience whether they were resolved to adhere to that policy or whether they were willing to reverse it. (Cries of “Never.”) It shows, at all events, that we, the office-seekers, we, the bloated aristocrats, were disinterested for once. (Loud laughter and cheers.) Yes, I take out of your pockets a salary of \$8,000 a year as Prime Minister—(cries of “You deserve it”)—and I might have remained in office quietly for eighteen months longer. There was no compulsion to go to the country, but I have given up \$12,000 of salary in order that I may come before you, the people of Canada, to know whether you want the N. P. to be maintained or not. (Loud cheers.) I have no doubt from the enthusiastic voices I hear around me that

The People will Stand by the National Policy.

(Cheers.) These voices are merely repetitions, affirming the same sound as will be heard at every poll in the whole Dominion. I am confident the result of the elections will be that the country will declare that the policy which the people calmly, coolly, and deliberately adopted in 1878 shall be the policy of Canada for the next five years. That is the reason we have appealed to the country, because, as I have said already, we know money is waiting for investment, and all that is wanted by capitalists in Canada, England and the United States, aye, in France and Germany, is to learn whether this country is of the fixed, constant opinion that the National Policy shall be continued as in 1878. (Cheers.) If, as I am sure it will be, the national voice confirms the decision given by the people in 1878, I can retire on my laurels. (Cries of “No.”) I have fought the good fight, and I can then make way for younger and stronger men. (Renewed cries of “No.”) I have carried out the policy which I believed, and I believe now, was for the interest of the country. (Loud cheers.) I have carried out that policy, and the country has

sustained me. And at the end of five years the manufacturers will have generated so much capital, while the workingmen, the skilled and unskilled labor that surrounds those varied industries, will have become so powerful, the capitalists will be linked together in associations, and workingmen will be bound together in trades unions, and they will fight the battle together. (Loud cheers.) Capital and labor will go hand in hand, and they will put down all attempts to make this country what it was before, a mere agricultural country, from which all skilled labor went to the United States to find employment, and that skilled labor will remain in the country. (Hear, hear.) Capital and labor will join together, and at the end of five years I defy Sir Richard Cartwright, if he had half a dozen titles, or Mr. Blake, or all the free-traders from John Stuart Mill down to David Mills—(loud laughter and cheers)—to take the edifice that the people of Canada will have raised. (Renewed cheers.) This country, blessed in every respect, with a fertile soil, a fine climate, an industrious people, with a manufacturing population consuming the products of the farmer, will go forward, and not all the attempts of theorists and philosophers—(laughter)—will set aside the actual state of facts, that Canada will become, like the Mother Country, great in manufacturing industries of "all kinds and great in agricultural development, for it possesses all the elements that make a great nation. (Loud cheers, and a Voice, "No more soup kitchens.") I hear the remark that we shall want no more soup kitchens. Gentlemen, I addressed a body of workingmen at Ottawa the other day, and I had to

Contrast the State of Affairs There Five Years Ago,

when Mr. Mackenzie was in power, and at the present time. I stated, and you may remember it was mentioned in all the newspapers at the time, that there was actually no employment for labor, and that the Parliament Buildings and the Government offices were surrounded by men asking for the means of earning their bread, asking for half or quarter time and half or quarter wages in order to support their families. I have seen it myself at Ottawa. I was in Opposition, but I lived there a year and a half before I came to Toronto, and I had my house besieged by persons asking employment, and that I would give them some work to prevent them from being compelled to beg. Now a different state of things prevails. The boot is on the other leg. (Cheers.) I told the

Ottawa workingmen this story. Years ago, when Parliament was sitting in Toronto, we had a five months' session. I was in the Government, and I had a very hard fight, because the Opposition was led by a *man*—George Brown—by a strong man, who made a strong fight of it. We got through at last, and when the guns were firing, telling us that the Governor-General was coming down to prorogue the House, a great friend of mine came up to me and said: "John A., you do not care a farthing for us now; when the Governor comes we have to go, and you no longer care." "No, my good friend," I said, "I have been kissing your feet for the last five months, and now you may kiss mine for the next seven." (Laughter.) So it was with the workingmen of Ottawa. For four years they were wandering round imploring the people to give them work. Now, in Ottawa the boot is on the other leg, and if I want any work done I cannot get it done because the men are so fully employed—(loud cheers)—and I think it is the same in Toronto, Hamilton, and elsewhere. The boot is on the other leg, and long may it remain there. (Enthusiastic cheers.) Every session during the last three years of Mr. Mackenzie's Government I moved an amendment in favor of the National Policy, but it was derided, laughed at, and voted down. I was treated contemptuously, as a theorist, as a man of no practical policy, and as merely getting up clap-trap notions for clap-trap purposes. The moment we came into power we carried the National Policy. For one whole month, night and day, Messrs. Mackenzie, Blake, Mills, Sir Richard Cartwright, and the whole of their party opposed every step we took, every motion we made, every readjustment we suggested, and opposed our tariff, both in principle and detail. The *Globe*, gentlemen, which is the able exponent of the principles of the Opposition, has been a free trade journal and is so now. Up to three weeks ago it advanced arguments in favor of free trade. Now, at the last moment, these gentlemen, finding that they are going to the people, that they want their votes, come to you, cap in hand, and say, "Gentlemen, we don't intend at all to interfere with the manufacturers." (Laughter.) Well, gentlemen, they were either fools or rogues; fools if they opposed a policy which they now admit was correct, or rogues for opposing it for factious purposes. What say they now? Mr. Mackenzie says, "We don't intend to disturb the manufacturers; we are going to educate them to

Free Trade by Slow Degrees;

we will show the people the fallacies of protection." This is something like the Dutchman who tried to reduce the feed of his horse by slow degrees from half a bushel of oats to a single wisp of straw, and thus do away with what he called the extravagance of the oats. Unfortunately for his experiment, just as he was about to succeed, the horse died. (Laughter.) So it is with Mr. Mackenzie's proposition, with the proposition of Mr. Blake, in the address which he published to the electors of West Durham. But perhaps Mr. Blake is not going to get in. He has got a man, a *Mail* to oppose him. (Laughter and cheers.) Mr. Blake says: "Of course the expenses of the country are so great that we shall have to keep up the taxation for the present, but by-and-bye we will reduce them, and take off all the burdens from the people." But, gentlemen, the horse will die, the manufactures will be abolished, and we shall be driven back to where we were in 1875-7, and you will suffer this great loss when I shall be too old to try to remedy matters again. (Voice—"I hope you will never get old.") Well, they say in Parliament I am too old for my friends in Opposition. (Laughter.) You, the people of Canada, know the party that laid down the great principle of national protection, and you put a Government in power to carry it out. You know that the present Government have honestly and sincerely carried that policy out, although they have been attacked in England for so doing. We all desire to stand well with the great old Mother Country, but her people are the judges of their interests and we of ours. (Cheers.) Although free trade prevails in England just now, although we have been reproved and I have been abused in the English papers, which said that Sir John ought to know better than to support any such faded old fallacy as protection and fair trade, nevertheless we have honestly and fairly carried that policy out. We have stood all the obloquy heaped upon us, and shall continue to do so, if we have your support. (Cheers.) I am not going to speak to you at any length to-night. (Cries of "Go on," "We like to hear you.") Like many old persons, I like to hear myself—(laughter)—but still I must make way for others, and although I may not think their speeches are so interesting as my own—(laughter)—I must affect to be modest and let them come forward and address you. Besides, you are reading men, and must be well acquainted with a subject which has been discussed for the last five years. It would be an insult to your intelligence now to discuss the abstract doctrines of protection and a National Policy. You have made up your minds on this subject, and my feeble arguments are not wanted. You

know and have felt the benefit of the National Policy, are resolved they shall be retained for the country, for yourselves, and for your children. (Cheers.) The Opposition, who have been for the last three years fighting about the National Policy, are now keeping singularly quiet about it. They are saying as little as possible about it. They pretend to be semi-converts. (Laughter.) You know what semi-converts are. We read in Scripture about the Church of Laodicea, and we are told they were spewed out of the mouth because they were neither hot nor cold. (Laughter.) We have nailed our colours to the mast, and we stand by the

National Policy.

"No poverty," new potatoes. (Laughter.) If we fall it will be your fault. Upon you and your children, upon the people, will fall the consequences of a revision of that policy which has been so successful. If Mr. Blake and his party came into power to-morrow, I do not suppose they would set to work to alter the tariff at once, but we know their position, and what they must as honest men carry out. They say they believe protection is a falsehood and a fallacy, and free trade a true principle, and they will educate the people up to it, and then by degrees men who have now invested their money in manufactures will get out of the scrape as soon as they can, and as to getting new capitalists to establish industries, that hope will be gone for ever; and therefore I say, that as men of common sense, let alone patriotism, you will stand by the Government that through good report and evil report stood by the National Policy and the national industries. (Loud cheers.) I say they are trying to lead you away. Just as sometimes a herring is drawn across a dog's nose to lead it away from the scent, so they are trying to raise a number of questions in order to draw you away from the question at issue. They talk about

The Boundary Award.

They say Ontario is robbed, because the award of three gentlemen appointed by Messrs. Mackenzie and Mowat has not so far been accepted. Now, in the first place the country in dispute either belongs to Ontario or to Manitoba. Manitoba is now being settled by Ontario men, and it is not of much consequence whether that country is owned by yourself or your sons. (Hear, hear.) But, gentlemen, I tell you as a lawyer, as a Constitutional lawyer—and it is with some pride

that I say I have never laid down yet, since 1867, a Constitutional principle which on reference to the highest Courts of the realm has not been sustained, and that I have not in one case expressed a Constitutional opinion but that the highest Courts in this country and England have sustained my opinion—I tell you, I say, as a Constitutional lawyer, that award, whether confirmed by the Legislature of Ontario or the Parliament at Ottawa, has no legal validity whatever, and that it is a mere piece of waste paper. It cannot and will not decide the question. There are only two ways of solving the question where the true boundary is. One is by an Act of the Imperial Parliament. The Imperial Parliament can settle the boundary or unsettle it. The other is by a judicial decision of the highest Court of Appeal in the British Empire. (Cheers.) Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, when that country was bought from the Hudson's Bay Company the Dominion paid £300,000 sterling, and gave one-twentieth of the whole of the land in that country, for it. Who paid that money? It was not Ontario. It was the whole Dominion. Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick paid that money, and are now paying that money, for that country. The Government of which I was a member were the trustees for the whole Dominion. I was an Ontario man, but as one of the trustees of the land for the whole Dominion, I was bound to get a legal decision that would settle beyond all possibility of a doubt where Ontario ended and where the North-West began. And ten long years ago I proposed that we should make up the case at once and send it home to England in order that the highest Court of Appeal there might settle it. And if the Reform Government of Ontario had yielded to that proposition—supposing that it would take two years to prepare the case, lay it before the Court, and get a decision—the whole matter would have been settled eight years ago, and this discussion would have never been raised. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, so long ago as before 1800, in a capital case, a case in which the life of a man depended, the case of the Queen *v.* Reinhardt, we find a Court of law unanimously deciding that the line ran close to Thunder Bay. Until that decision was reversed in some way or other by the highest Court of Appeal, we were bound as law-abiding people to hold that that decision, given by a competent tribunal after a discussion of the whole subject, was correct. Now, the Government here in Toronto would not agree to an appeal, and they left it to three men to decide where the true line is. Now, I tell you as a lawyer, and notwithstanding my respect

for the three arbitrators, who were friends of mine, that whether their judgment is right or wrong it is

A Mere Piece of Waste Paper.

And if a trial for murder in the territory in question came up, and the question arose as to whether the crime was committed in Ontario or Manitoba, the award would not decide it, no Act passed either in Toronto or Ottawa would decide it, and the murderer might get off on account of the uncertainty of the decision. (Applause.) Now at the time the case was brought up for discussion in the House of Commons at Ottawa I was ill, and was confined to my house, but when I heard that the discussion was on I went down and lay on a sofa in the Parliament House, waiting to see whether Mr. Blake—who is a first-rate equity lawyer, though knowing very little of Constitutional law—would risk his reputation as a lawyer by defending the award and declaring it valid. Gentlemen, he dared not do it. (Hear, hear.) He was silent. (Hear, hear.) He left that to Mr. David Mills. And who was he? A member of Parliament who was supposed to fight the battles of the people, but who was the hired servant of Mr. Mowat, from whom he had received money to make out a case against the Dominion. Mr. Mills spoke of the long brief for which he was paid—I do not know how much—from Mr. Mowat.

A Voice—\$3,400.

SIR JOHN MACDONALD—But Mr. Blake did not venture to get up and defend the award; for, as a lawyer, he could not do that. (Hear, hear.) Gentlemen, we do not vary from our position on this matter. We say the Dominion does not want, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and British Columbia, do not want one inch of land which belongs to Ontario. All we want is a proper settlement of the question. Where is the line? (Cheers.) Why, if the whole North-West belongs to Ontario, Ontario has a right to it, and that, gentlemen, is the simple question.

What the Opposition are Keeping Back.

But I have to tell you another thing which Mr. Mowat and the Opposition have kept secret—that not a single acre of that land belongs to the Province of Ontario, and I will tell you why. You cannot quite easily understand it. The land belonged, so far back as the grant of Charles II. could give it,

to the Hudson Bay Company, but it was subject to the Indian title. The Indians were the original owners of the land. They and their ancestors for centuries had owned the lands, and it has been the pride of England and of Canada to stand by the rights of the Indians, for barbarous and wild though they be, they are fellow-beings, made by the same God and subjects of the same Sovereign. (Loud cheers.) Well, those lands all belonged to the Indians until the Dominion Government purchased them. Those lands were purchased, not by the Province of Ontario—it did not pay a farthing, and refused to pay a farthing—but by the Dominion, and you are paying taxes on account of that purchase. The people of Vancouver Island on the Pacific are taxed to pay the Indians for the deed of surrender they gave. To whom did they surrender the lands? They did not give any deed to Ontario. By seven treaties the Indians of the North-West conveyed the lands to Canada, and every acre belongs now to the people of Canada, and not to you as the people of Ontario. So much is that the case that the Government of Manitoba says, "We do not want that country, because the only consequence of taking it will be that we will have the expense and trouble of governing it while the whole lands belong to the Dominion." (Cheers.) If you will take the trouble to look at the speech which Mr. Mackenzie, who was then head of the Government, placed in the mouth of the Earl of Dufferin when he was Governor-General, at the prorogation of Parliament in 1877, you will find that Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Blake and that Government made the Earl of Dufferin, as the representative of the Sovereign, say that we congratulate you on having purchased all that land from the Indians, and on the fact that the whole of that magnificent country, from Lake Superior to the Rocky Mountains, belongs to the Dominion of Canada. (Loud cheers.) That was the language placed by Mr. Mackenzie in the mouth of the Earl of Dufferin, and that land now belongs to the Dominion of Canada. Mr. Mowat does not say that. He says we have lost all that timber and land. Even if all the territory he asks for were awarded, there is not one stick of timber, one acre of land, or one lump of lead, iron or gold that does not belong to the Dominion, or to people who purchased from the Dominion Government. So it is absurd to say that Ontario has been robbed; she has not been robbed of a farthing. (Cheers.) You know there is Brantford in Ontario, and that there is the township of Onondaga. Mr. Mowat is the head of the Provincial Government, but that township belongs to the Indians; it does not belong either to the Ontario Government or the

Dominion Government. In the same way all the country from Lake Superior to Red River belonged to the Indians until it was ceded to the purchaser, and the person who purchased it is known as Queen Victoria, the Queen of the Dominion of Canada. (Loud and long continued cheering.) That is a plain story, and you, gentlemen, will understand how unfair, fallacious and wicked have been the charges made that we, actuated by improper motives, have been trying to rob Ontario, when it is a matter of not the slightest consequence so far as the land is concerned whether that land belongs to the people of Ontario or to their sons up in Manitoba. My son has gone there—(cheers)—and I suppose a good many of your sons have gone there also.

A VOICE—"Your son was there before."

SIR JOHN MACDONALD—My son went there as a soldier to fight Riel; now he has gone there as a settler. (Cheers.) You, gentlemen, can quite understand how false and unfair the charge is which has been brought against me that I have endeavored to rob or despoil Ontario. It is just a herring dragged across the track in front of the noses of the hounds to prevent them following the scent. We were hunting down the Opposition with a dog which had on its collar "N. P." Following the true scent, it was about running the party to the earth, when there was dragged across the track a herring marked "Boundary," but he is too old a dog to be led away by the smell of a herring, and he is following the free trade fox to the death. (Long continued applause.)

The Streams Disallowance.

Another cry raised was that we are destroying provincial rights because we disallowed the streams bill. You are all well aware, gentlemen, that a Government cannot exist unless it is supported by a majority of Parliament, and that Parliament is composed of members from the different provinces in the Dominion. Do you think the Government, if they trampled on the rights of the provinces, would be supported by members from those provinces? Mr. Mowat has eighty-eight members representing Ontario in the Local House; but the people of this province have also eighty-eight representatives in the Dominion Parliament, elected by the same people, under the same franchise. Quebec is more jealous respecting her rights than any other province. Why? Because it has different languages, laws, religion, and institutions, which the

people brought with them from Old France. They are, as I have said, exceedingly anxious to preserve their provincial rights against Dominion authority, and yet Parliament, by an enormous majority, composed of members of every province, voted that the Government were right in disallowing the Streams bill. (Cheers.) Shall I tell you the story of the Streams bill? (Cries of "Yes.") The two parties are McLaren and Caldwell. You have read at school the fable as to whether the ox gored the bull or the bull gored the ox. Mr. McLaren was like the most of you, if not all, a workingman. He came to this country with his axe in his hand, and he worked himself up from being a labourer in a shanty to becoming a lumber merchant with large interests in the lumber trade. He had made large sums of money by hard-handed and honest industry. He obtained from the Mowat Government large timber limits on the Upper Ottawa. The timber is now being cut away in the vicinity of the Ottawa river, and as the supply recedes the lumberers have to bring it down small streams and creeks flowing into the Ottawa. Mr. McLaren had running through his limits, which he had acquired from the Ontario Government, and for which he was still paying a yearly rent, a small brook or stream. It was not a navigable river—a boat could not float on it. It was not what is called a floatable river, as saw logs could not come by it. Scarcely more than a chip could come down in summer. Mr. McLaren, an enterprising man, wished to get out his timber, and what did he do? He bought land on both sides of this stream, built at great expense a dam, made an artificial lake to store up the water behind this dam, in order to float his logs. (A Voice—"You are speaking against the law.") I heard a man say I am speaking against the law. I do not think he knows much about the law, and he must know little about justice, or he would not interrupt me in the middle of an explanation. (Cheers.) Well, Mr. McLaren by means of these improvements was able to get his logs down the stream, and could send them to Ottawa to find a market. Mr. Caldwell, who also had limits, had not sufficient enterprise to build a dam for himself. Perhaps he had no stream to do it in. The moment he found Mr. McLaren building this dam, he said he would use it, and wanted to force his logs over it, which would have prevented Mr. McLaren using his own property, and on which he had spent over \$100,000. (A voice, \$250,000.) Well, at any rate, I have not exaggerated. He was resolved to force his way, Mr. McLaren resisted, and there was

a suit at law in the courts as to whether Mr. Caldwell had the right or not. When before the court, one judge decided in his favour, and another against him, and the matter was standing in the Court of Appeal, and is still standing before the Supreme Court as to which was the right or wrong. It was improper, unneighbourly, and unchristian for Mr. Caldwell to try to take advantage of another man's money and improvements in this way. He would not wait for the decision of the Supreme Court.

Helping a Political Friend.

You know why. Mr. Mowat was in power here. Mr. Mowat is a Grit; Mr. Caldwell is a Grit. (Laughter.) Mr. McLaren is a Conservative. But more than that, Mr. Caldwell, a very respectable man in his way for a Grit—(laughter)—had a nephew whom he had elected to the Legislature, and who was one of Mr. Mowat's supporters, and as I heard a gentleman say, a rather uncertain supporter. He had fits of independence. It was necessary to keep Mr. Caldwell right, and so Mr. Caldwell, the younger, in order to help his uncle, got a Bill passed declaring that everybody had a right to use the dam and send logs over it, although they had not contributed a farthing towards its construction, and although, on account of the shortness of the season, Mr. McLaren would be prevented from using his own property. A clause was inserted in the Bill stating that Mr. McLaren might get compensation by charging tolls. In the first place, he would lose the interest on his money, and in the second, the opportunity of doing his Summer's work. The amount of toll he would have got from the logs of Mr. Caldwell would take to the Day of Judgment to pay for the expenditure of Mr. McLaren. (Laughter.) As I pointed out when speaking on this subject in Parliament, this illusory compensation was adding insult to injury. It would be better to give everybody the right of using the improvements for nothing than to make this pretence at compensation. It reminds me of the story of the old lady whose hen was stolen by a neighbor. The latter promised to pay her for the value of the hen out of the eggs the hen laid. (Laughter.) This question then is the other herring drawn across the nose of the staunch old hound, the N. P. What else can I say? We disallowed the Bill, and there was a great cry about Provincial rights. Well, the fact is that there were more Bills disallowed during the time Messrs. Mackenzie and Blake were in power, from 1874 to

1878
1867
were
prop
and
the C
the q
Coun
Orde
disal
Islan
in di
they
some
Const
the ri

It
are m
attach
indivi
legal
uncer
Engla
man's
could
root o
I, sir
gover
Sover
my d
hear.
of ob
to dis
may
consc
the r
losing
bility
appl
man
Legis
other

had the
ed in his
standing
fore the
It was
ldwell to
improve-
on of the

ere. Mr.
er.) Mr.
that, Mr.
a Grit—
d to the
rters, and
supporter.

keep Mr.
n order to
ybody had
ough they
ction, and
ason, Mr.
a property.
McLaren
first place,
the second,
amount of
well would
enditure of
en speaking
nsation was
everybody
an to make
the story of

The latter
of the eggs
s the other
d hound, the
he Bill, and
ell, the fact
ng the time
from 1874 to

1878, than there were by the Conservative Government from 1867 till now. The reasons why we disallowed this measure were three. In the first place, it interfered with the rights of property; in the second place, it was retroactive in its effect; and in the third place, it was interfering with a case before the Courts, and no Act should be passed till the Courts decide the question. What do you think we did? In the Order-in-Council disallowing the Bill we copied word for word the Order-in-Council passed by Mr. Mackenzie's Government in disallowing a Bill passed by the Legislature of Prince Edward Island exactly to the same effect. (Cheers.) The Government in disallowing a Provincial Bill have to consider well whether they are interfering with Provincial rights. But there are some great primary principles which lie at the basis of all Constitutional government, and one was the preservation of the rights of property.

The Duty of the Central Government.

It was the boast of civilization that the rights of property are maintained. There was an attack—a causeless, senseless attack upon the rights of the property of a single, humble individual, ruining him and his property—an attack upon the legal tribunals of the country, introducing an element of uncertainty which would prevent people from Germany and England coming here, because it would prove to them that no man's rights in property were safe, and that the Legislature could sweep them at any moment. The bill struck at the very root of the prosperity and reputation of the Dominion. And I, sir, as Prime Minister, as chiefly responsible for the good government of this country, under the representative of our Sovereign, would be justly chargeable with a failure to perform my duty if I did not respect the rights of property. (Hear, hear.) What did I care if my action was followed by a storm of obloquy and unpopularity? It is my duty in my position to disregard fears of unpopularity, to do that which, though it may prejudice me in the eyes of some, I believe in my conscience to be for the good of the country, and to protect the rights of property in the community, even at the risk of losing the position I hold. (Cheers.) So I take the responsibility of that act, and I say I will do it again. (Loud applause.) I say that no matter how humble and helpless a man may be, if he has rights, and if any Government or any Legislature in the wantonness of power, or for a political or other purpose, destroys those rights, I will come forward, and

no matter what the consequence may be, no matter if I am expelled the next day from office, I will stand by those rights—(cheers)—and I will have, at all events, the consolation of knowing that the sober second thought of the country will say I was a good and faithful servant to do so—(renewed applause)—even though by doing so I had brought down upon myself the condemnation of Oliver Mowat, Esquire. (Loud laughter.)

The Necessity of Hard Work.

Gentlemen, I have to ask you to move your boots pretty lively between now and the 20th of June. (Laughter and applause.) I have no fear of the result if you will work. Do not sleep; do not be too confident. I have said again and again that the two most uncertain things in the world are an election and a horse-race. (Laughter.) Don't let the Opposition horse beat the good old N.P. nag by a nose. (Applause.) You must show your tail to the hindmost horse. (Hear, hear.) Indeed you must win the race. (Continued cheering.) You must remember though that you are fighting the purists, and with them there is such a thing as money being used. (Hear, hear.) "Oh, purists never use money!" you say; but you surely cannot forget that one of the best supporters of the Grit party, H. H. Cook—a very good fellow—confessed to having spent in his own election as much as \$28,000.

A VOICE—I bet you.

ANOTHER VOICE—And there was Walker.

SIR JOHN MACDONALD.—Yes; the gentleman who wrote "Come along, John; let's put down bribery and corruption; I've lots of money."

ANOTHER VOICE.—And Paddy Hughes!

SIR JOHN MACDONALD.—Mr. Hughes is a countryman of mine—(laughter)—so we'll say nothing about him. He's a pretty good fellow, to be sure; but he tried to get a plum, and the plum had a stone in it, and he was sorry for it. (Loud laughter.) But, gentlemen, let me in all seriousness warn my friends not to rest on their oars, or to fancy that the goodness of their cause, or the fact that the majority of the people are in favour of the National Policy, will prevent the occurrence of a mistake. Why, a factious minority will beat the largest majority in the world if the majority is inactive. (Hear, hear.) I tell you this, that the hesitation I have in my mind about telling you that I am sure we will have an overwhelming

majority is caused by the fear lest my friends, knowing that, and conscious of the justness of our cause, will rest on their oars, and stay at home. Gentlemen, those who do that take upon themselves an awful responsibility, and they will, should we lose, carry to their dying day the reproach in their consciences that they, by their neglect, have been instrumental in bringing about the ruin of their country. (Hear, hear.)

The Redistribution Bill.

A VOICE—What about the Redistribution bill?

SIR JOHN MACDONALD—I am asked what about the Redistribution bill.

Mr. PLUMB—I think I was redistributed as badly as anybody. (Hear, hear.)

Sir JOHN MACDONALD—Well, the Grits seldom complain that they are hived altogether. It seems they do not like the association. (Laughter.) I told my constituents the other day—well, I hope, indeed, I know, they will be my constituents—(cheers)—a story. When the Reform Club was built in London, it was the finest club-house there, and the club-room was really a magnificent chamber. Theodore Hook, who was a great wit, and the editor of a Tory paper, was taken into the Reform Club by a friend who desired to show him the place. When he was in the club-room the friend said, “Well, how do you like our room?” Said Hook: “I would rather have your room than your company.” (Loud laughter.) So it is with the Grits. They do not like each other’s company. (Renewed laughter.) They like to associate with Conservative gentlemen such as you. Your being with them rather gives tone to their society. Gentlemen, I will tell you what we did. In the first place, to show you that we were impartial, I may say that Niagara and Cornwall, being under the average population, we wiped them out, notwithstanding that Niagara, represented so ably by Mr. Plumb, would return a Conservative again, and and Cornwall was sure to elect a Conservative again. These boroughs were sure to return Conservatives, but in order to equalize the population we wiped them out, and deprived our party of two certain votes.

A VOICE—You gerrymandered yourself.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD—But, say the Opposition, you have not equalized the population all round. Some constituencies still have small populations and some large. But, gentlemen,

we had only four members to give—six altogether, with Cornwall and Niagara—and we could not divide up every county out of the 92 in Ontario according to population; but whatever we did, we did in that direction. We had only six constituencies to add, and we so arranged the matter that if you look at the population, you will find that wherever a change was made, it was in the direction of representation by population. That is the only true principle. A Government is not bound to see that certain counties are Grit and others Conservative, and arrange them according to their supposed political proclivities. In 1874, when there was a sweep made of the Conservative party in consequence of the Pacific slander, when we had not a corporal's guard, the majority of the constituencies in Ontario were Grit. In 1878, when the people had come to their senses and restored us to power, the majority was Conservative. Who, then, is to decide as to the political proclivities of any constituency? The only principle is representation by population, and that we carried out. To give a striking illustration of the absurdity of trying to lay out constituencies with regard to supposed political leaning, look at the North-West. Twenty, twenty-five, or even fifty thousand Ontario people may go there this Summer. When settled we have to divide the territory up into Townships and Counties. Have they to be laid out according to the political views of the population? If there happens to be a lot of Grits in one corner, must we consider that; and so with Conservatives? The only true principle, I repeat, is representation by population, and that we have carried out. You know I am what they call a perennial flower; I am always in the Government, or nearly always—(laughter)—and I happened to be in the Government in 1872 when, according to our Constitution, we had to readjust the representation. The census takes place every ten years, 1871, 1881, and 1891, and so on, and by our Constitution we are obliged to readjust the Parliamentary representation after the census has been taken. In 1872 I was Prime Minister, as I am now, and the duty was thrown on me, not to give four new constituencies to Ontario, but to give eight new constituencies. I came down with my plan, as I did last session, and I was abused as a gerrymanderer, as one who was "hiving" the Grits, as a corruptionist, and indeed just as I was last session. When I brought down my scheme last session, Mr. Blake, Mr. Mills, Mr. Mackenzie, and others rose in the House and stated that the plan in 1872 was an honest and good one, and they wished me to stick to it. I said that if they would look back at their

speeches they would find, if such were the case with respect to the scheme, that their comments were neither just nor honest; that their attacks in 1882 were just as dishonest; and I said I would be in the Government of 1892, and in that year you will do exactly as you have done now, you will blame me for not adhering to the settlement of 1882. (Laughter and cheers, and a Voice, "What about Mr. Mowat's gerrymandering?") I cannot say anything about Mr. Mowat's gerrymandering; he is too small potatoes for me. (Laughter.) He did his little best. (Laughter and cheers.)

A Long Life in the Country's Service.

Gentlemen, I feel great pride in occupying the position that has been awarded me by the people of this country. I can, at my age, have no other wish than to live well in the minds of my fellow-countrymen, and when I die to live well in their recollection. (Cheers.) I have had a long life of politics, a long life of official duties. I have committed many mistakes. Looking back with the light of experience, there are many things I have done wrongly, and many things I have neglected that I should have done. These rise to me; I know them, I recognize them; but I would be more than human if I had not committed errors; I say this to you, and I believe the majority of the country will believe me when I state that whatever I have done, in every act of legislation and administration, I have tried, according to the best of my judgment, to do what I could for the well-being of good government and the future prosperity of this my beloved country.

The right hon. gentleman resumed his seat amid loud and long-continued cheering.

The License Question.

At a public meeting at Yorkville on the night of June 1, the following question, in writing, was put to Sir John Macdonald:—"What is your opinion of the constitutionality of the Ontario License Act?"

SIR JOHN MACDONALD replied as follows:—The only provision in the British North America Act which authorizes the issue of licenses by Provincial Governments is one that allows Provincial Legislatures, for revenue purposes only, to charge a license fee to auctioneers, inn-keepers, and such like. This

law does not give the Local Legislatures the power to prevent persons becoming inn-keepers, which is as free to any person to enter into as to become merchants; but if for the purpose of raising a revenue the Provincial Legislature thought it necessary to put on a license fee or tax they would be at liberty to do so. The general power of Government and the power to regulate Trade and Commerce is vested by the Confederation Act in the Parliament of the Dominion, and I hope that parliament will do away with the centralization of power on the officers appointed by the Government of Ontario, I fear for political purposes, and will restore to the municipalities the power of regulating tavern licenses within their own counties. They are the best judges as to what is required in their localities, and they should have the power either of prohibiting taverns altogether or of limiting the number as they may think best; and in my opinion any license fee should be paid into the revenue of the municipalities less a moderate charge by the Government to defray the expenses of management. (Loud cheers.)

The License Question

At a public meeting in Toronto on the night of June 1, the following question was put to the John A. Macdonald Club:—What is your opinion of the constitutional right of the Province of Ontario to license?

The John A. Macdonald Club resolved as follows:—The only power given to the British North American Act which authorizes the Province of Ontario to license is the power to license the sale of liquor for medicinal purposes, for revenue purposes, and for other purposes. The power to license for other purposes is not given to the Province.

prevent
person
purpose
ought it
ld be at
and the
the Con-
I hope
f power
ic, I fear
ipalities
eir own
quired in
r of pro-
r as they
ould be
moderate
manage-